

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Entry of this Amendment under Rule 116 is merited as it raises no new issues and requires no further search.

Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 13-18 are pending in the application. Claims 9 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The *35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph* rejection of claims 9 and 12 are moot as the rejected claims have been canceled.

The new art rejections are noted. In particular, claims 1-12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watabe* (US 5,505,289) in view of *Spring* (US 4,230,213). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watabe* in view of *Spring* as applied to claim 1, and further in view of *Parish* (US 5,156,250).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, because the art singly or in combination fails to disclose, teach or suggest all limitations of the rejected claim, especially the feature of independent **claim 1** regarding “a container disposed at a rear face of the door and below the guide part for collecting the foreign matter.”

*Watabe* relates to a bill processor having a liquid collector 50 for collecting liquid that has entered through a bill inlet 16 (Col. 4, lines 36-39). The liquid collector 50 comprises a concavity 51 which has a V-shaped rib 52 and a dam 53, and a rubber tube 54 for guiding liquid downwards from a hole 53b of the concavity 51 (Col. 4, lines 36-55 and Figs. 4-6).

*Spring* relates to a chute 15 of a dispensing machine. The chute 15 has a wire grid deflector 21 extending laterally across the chute 15 to separate liquid from coins. Furthermore, below the

chute 15 there is a trough 25 for receiving and draining away liquid which runs down the chute 15 (Col. 2, lines 47-53, and Fig. 2). The trough 25 is defined in *Spring* as a discharge trough (column 1, lines 40-41).

The Examiner alleges in the present Office Action that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify *Watabe's* gaming machine and incorporate *Spring's* trough, in order to collect and store foreign matter, and prevent the foreign matter from entering the bill processor and other parts of the gaming machine.

However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position that the claimed container is disclosed in *Spring* as the trough 25. *Spring's* trough 25 "receives and drains away any water or other liquid" (Col. 2, lines 47-49). That is to say, unlike the claimed container, *Spring's* trough 25 does not collect any water. Furthermore, according to Fig. 2 of *Spring*, the front part (opposite to wall 27) of the trough 25 is open and hence it appears that the trough 25 can not collect any water. Further, by definition, a trough is no container as it is not configured to contain foreign matter or liquid. A trough like the one disclosed in *Spring* is configured only to discharge or drain liquid away as correctly described by the reference.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed container and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

As to **claims 3, 11 and 17**, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation that "it is inherent for the container to be detachable from the rear face of the door." First, as discussed above, trough 25 of *Spring* is no container, and therefore, it is not inherent that trough 25 is detachably mounted to the rear face of the door as presently claimed. Quite the contrary, the term "trough" itself suggests that the trough 25 is fixed to the machine like a gutter (a type of trough) is fixed to the roof of a house. An element like trough 25, which is configured for draining away

liquid (*Spring* at column 2 line 48), need not and should not be detachable from the dispensing machine. Accordingly, claims 3, 17 and 11 are separately patentable over the applied art of record.

As to **claim 5**, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation that the claimed transparent or semi-transparent container is an obvious choice of design. The Examiner again argues trough 25 of *Spring* as a container. However, Applicants respectfully submit that trough 25 of *Spring* is not a container, but merely a channel or drainage for discharging liquid as clearly disclosed by the reference. A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that such channel/trough/gutter/drainage configuration need not be transparent or semi-transparent, especially in view of the fact that the liquid is flowing through the trough when it is concealed from the user (*Spring* at FIG. 1), and therefore, there is no particular benefit of making the trough transparent or semi-transparent. Accordingly, claim 5 is separately patentable over the applied art of record.

As to **claims 10 and 18**, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation that the claimed latches and pins constitute a design choice. The teaching of *Watabe* relied upon by the Examiner is related to the bill processor (column 2 lines 61-67) and is inapplicable to any attachment of the trough 25 of *Spring* to the door of *Watabe* if the references are properly combinable which Applicants contend to the contrary. Accordingly, claims 10 and 18 are separately patentable over the applied art of record.

As to **claim 16**, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that FIG. 2 of *Spring* teaches or suggests the claimed container comprising (i) an upper narrowed portion that has an opening vertically aligned with a lower end of the guide part for receiving the foreign matter guided downwardly by the guide part; and (ii) a lower enlarged portion for containing the foreign matter received through the opening of the upper narrowed portion. It is clearly depicted in FIG. 2 of *Spring* that the upper portion of trough 25 (top of rear wall 27) and the lower portion of trough 25 (where the pointing line from reference numeral 25 ends) are of the same size, rather than different

sizes as presently claimed. Accordingly, claim 16 is separately patentable over the applied art of record.

As to **claim 17**, the applied references do not teach or suggest a container which is detachably mounted to the door (see the discussion with respect to claim 3), has an upper narrowed portion and a lower enlarged portion (see the discussion with respect to claim 16), and detachably mounted to the door in a vicinity of a shoulder between the upper narrowed portion and the lower enlarged portion. *Watabe* and *Spring* fail to supply any disclosure or suggestion of the place where the container is mounted to the door. Accordingly, claim 17 is separately patentable over the applied art of record.

Accordingly, all claims in the present application are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under *37 C.F.R. 1.136* is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

Benjamin Hauptman  
Registration No. 29,310

USPTO Customer No. 22429  
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
Date: October 22, 2007  
BJH:KL/tal